

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 16, 17, and 25 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,308). The Examiner stated essentially that Saito teaches all the limitations of Claim 1, 3, 5, and 17.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "injection hole post structures provided between projection portions of said sealing material forming said injection hole formed of the same material as said post structures, wherein said injection hole post structures are arranged in a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns."

Saito teaches a liquid crystal display having one or more injection ports (see col. 9, lines 2-4). Saito does not teach or suggest injection hole post structures arranged in a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns, essentially as claimed in Claim 1. Saito teaches poll spacers SPC-P, which are located within a display area. The poll spaces SPC-P of Saito are not provided between projection portions of a sealing material forming the injection hole. Therefore, Saito fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 1.

Claims 3, 5, and 17 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito as applied to Claims 1, 3, and 5, and further in view of Ohashi (USPN 5,798,813). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Saito and Ohashi teach or suggest all the limitations of Claim 16.


Claim 16 depends from Claim 1. Claim 16 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claim 25 claims, *inter alia*, “injection hole post structures provided in an area near said injection hole and outside of the display area formed of the same material as said post structures, wherein said injection hole post structures are arranged in a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns.”

The cited references are not believed to teach or suggest “injection hole post structures provided in an area near said injection hole and outside of the display area formed of the same material as said post structures, wherein said injection hole post structures are arranged in a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns.” For example, Saito teaches poll spacers SPC-P, which are located within a display area. The poll spaces SPC-P of Saito are not provided outside of the display area as claimed in Claim 25. Therefore, Saito fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 25.

Accordingly, Claims 1-3, 5, 16, 17, and 25 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated. The Examiner’s withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. For the forgoing reasons, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889